



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

11A

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/708,943

04/02/2004

Long-Hui Lin

LKSP0028USA

2942

27765 7590 11/28/2007
NORTH AMERICA INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY CORPORATION
P.O. BOX 506
MERRIFIELD, VA 22116

EXAMINER

GUTIERREZ, ANTHONY

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2857

NOTIFICATION DATE

DELIVERY MODE

11/28/2007

ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

winstonhsu.uspto@gmail.com
Patent.admin.uspto.Rcv@naipo.com
mis.ap.uspto@naipo.com.tw

Interview Summary

Application No.

10/708,943

Applicant(s)

LIN, LONG-HUI

Examiner

Anthony Gutierrez

Art Unit

2857

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Anthony Gutierrez.

(3) Ding Yu Tan.

(2) Hal Wachsmen.

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: 20 November 2007.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.

If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: 1-9.

Identification of prior art discussed: Nozoe et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,777,677 B2).



Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☒ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.


HAL WACHSMAN
PRIMARY EXAMINER
10/28/07

Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: With respect to the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 112, 1st paragraph, applicant's representative addressed that he believed that one of ordinary skill in the art would understand that a wafer sample would include a single die, and thus that the claimed invention was supported by the original disclosure consistent with M.P.E.P. 2163. Examiner Wachsmann addressed that a properly filed affidavit may provide additional support for Applicant's position. With respect to the prior art rejection, Applicant requested to know if based on the present search if a claim drawn to include that the three methods we performed depending on the type of defect detected, would be considered allowable over the known prior art. The Examiner indicated that if fully supported by the original disclosure that this amendment may be helpful, but that he was not sure that the amendment might not have ultimately been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention. Applicant also addressed that he believed the review sequence of Nozoe et al. was not consistent with the claimed limitation of mapping. The Examiner indicated that the claims were drawn to a 'mapping analysis' and that the steps that comprised the mapping analysis were met by the review sequence of Nozoe et al. The Examiners indicated that further search and consideration would be made to any formally proposed amendment.